

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03607 01 OF 02 071720Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 EB-07 /096 W

----- 077792

R 071545Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2587

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDELMBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3607

NOFORN

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DULY 4 TRILATERAL MEETING IN BONN

REF: A) STATE 156821; B) USNATO 3494 DTG 281340Z JUNE 75

C) STATE 156829 D) STATE 157750 E) STATE 144904; F) STATE 149343

1. AT INVITATION OF UK AND FRG, US REPS (MESSRS. RESOR, HIGGINS AND MICHAEL) ATTENDED MEETING IN FRG FONOFF ON JULY 4. FRG WAS REPRESENTED BY AMBASSADOR ROTH, DR. RUTH, AND COLONAL SCHILLER (MOD). UK WAS REPRESENTED BY TICKELL, WOOD, MAYHEW AND CLARK.

2. US REPS CIRCULATED US DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO AHG GUIDANCE (AS TRANSMITTED IN REF A) FOR INFORMATION AND COMMENT. INTENT WAS TO GIVE UK AND FRG ADVANCE LOOK AT SUPPLEMENT PRIOR TO MISSION CIRCULATION IN SPC AS A WHOLE. US REPS ALSO GAVE UK AND FRG COPIES OF ANSWERS TO TEN UK QUESTIONS (TRANSCRIBED FROM REFS B, SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03607 01 OF 02 071720Z

C AND D).

3. WORK ON THE FOLLOWING THREE PAPERS WAS DISCUSSED DURING THE MEETING:

A. UK LATEST VERSION OF PAPER ON OPTION III -- CEILINGS AND CONSTRAINTS (REF E) IS BEING REVISED TAKING INTO ACCOUNT US AND FRG COMMENTS. THE UK INTENDS TO DISTRIBUTE THE PAPER RIGHT AWAY ON A TRILATERAL BASIS. US AND FRG WILL PROVIDE COMMENTS TO UK DIRECTLY ON THE TEXT. IF NECESSARY A TRILATERAL MEETING COULD BE HELD TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS STEMMING FROM THE NEW DRAFT. IT IS EXPECTED THAT UK WILL CIRCULATE THIS PAPER TRILATERALLY NO LATER THAN JULY 11. THE UK STILL FEELS THAT FOLLOWING TRILATERAL REVIEW, THE REVISED PAPER SHOULD BE INTRODUCED TO THE SPC. UK WILL TRY TO DRAFT THE PAPER IN SUCH A WAY AS NOT TO UNDERMINE THE ALLIED NEGOTIATING POSITION THROUGH INDICATING A POSSIBLE FALLBACK ON TANK LIMITATIONS.

B. FRG PAPER IS BEING PREPARED ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF MANPOWER AND EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. THE PAPER IS INTENDED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT ALLIED MANPOWER LIMITATIONS ARE SUFFICIENT TO GIVE THE EAST REASONABLY EFFECTIVE PROTECTION AGAINST INCREASES OF ALLIED ARMAMENTS, PARTICULARLY IN THE CASE OF TANKS. THE FRG WILL CIRCULATE ITS PAPER TRILATERALLY. THERE MAY BE SOME DEALY ON THIS AS TANDECKI IS ILL.

C. THE UK AGREED TO DRAFT A PAPER WHICH THEY BELIEVE IS NECESSARY FOR TRILATERAL USE IN DEALING WITH A FALLBACK POSITION WITH RESPECT TO POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS ON NON-US NATO NUCLEAR SYSTEMS. THIS ISSUE WAS SEEN AS A DELICATE ONE BUT ONE WHICH NEEDED TO BE ADDRESSED. THE PROBLEM COULD BE PUT TO THE ALLIANCE AS A WHOLE WHEN AND IF THE ISSUE ARISES IN NEGOTIATIONS. ACCORDINGLY, THE UK BELIEVES THAT THERE SHOULD BE A WRITTEN TRILATERAL UNDERSTANDING WHICH COULD BE SHOWN TO MINISTERS OF THE THREE GOVERNMENTS SETTING FORTH AN AGREED FALLBACK POSITION. THE UK WILL DRAFT THE TEXT OF SUCH AN UNDERSTANDING AS SOON AS IT HAS AVAILABLE TO IT THE NECESSARY SUPPORTING DATA WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT PROGRAMS OF THE US AND THE FRG. US REPS UNDERTOOK TO SUPPLY THE NECESSARY INFORMATION ON US PLANS TO THE UK. THE FRG SAID THAT IT WOULD MAKE ITS DATA AVAILABLE.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03607 01 OF 02 071720Z

4. THE THREE PAPERS OUTLINED IN PARA 3 ABOVE CAN BE DEVELOPED INDEPENDENTLY.

5. RESIDUAL LIMITATIONS OF SOVIET TANKS. IN THE COURSE OF DISCUSSION OF THE FRG PAPER (PARA 3 B ABOVE) FRG REP ROTH, IN RESPONSE TO US REPS QUESTIONS, EXPRESSLY STATED THAT THE FRG WOULD GO ALONG WITH THE US AND UK DESIRE THAT THERE BE A LIMITATION ON THE RESIDUAL LEVEL OF SOVIET TANKS. THIS REPRESENTS A SHIFT IN FRG THINKING WHICH HAS RECENTLY TENDED TO PUT EMPHASIS ON RELIANCE OF MANPOWER LIMITATIONS. FRG REPS MADE CLEAR THAT THEY CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT LIMITS ON NON-US NATO ARMAMENTS SHOULD RESULT FROM MANPOWER LIMITATIONS ONLY.

6. LIMITATIONS ON NON-US NATO TANKS. THERE WAS CONSENSUS THAT CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO BROADENING PARA 9 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE (REF F) TO ADDRESS TANKS AS WELL AS NUCLEAR ELEMENTS. FRG ALSO ARGUED FOR FURTHER ELABORATION OF THE PARA 9 UNDERSTANDINGS IN THE SUPPLEMENT TO AHG GUIDANCE, EVEN IF SUCH ELABORATION WERE ONLY A RESTATEMENT OF PARA 9.

7. DEFINITION OF COMMON CEILING. ROTH OPENED THE TRILATERAL MEETING CALLING FOR EMPHASIS ON A "COLLECTIVE" COMMON CEILING, AND NO NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS. BOTH THE UK AND THE FRG ARGUED IN FAVOR OF SPECIFYING THE COMMON CEILING IN NUMERICAL TERMS. US REPS RE-STATED THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST DOING THIS. THEY INDICATED THAT CONSIDERATION COULD BE GIVEN, AMONG OTHER SOLUTIONS, TO THE POSSIBILITY OF DEFINING THE PHASE I COMMITMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING AS THE ELIMINATION OF THE EXISTING DISPARITY IN MANPOWER. THEY WENT ON TO POINT OUT THAT THIS DISPARITY MIGHT BE QUANTIFIED IN THE COURSE OF PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS, PARTICULARLY IN THE COURSE OF NEGOTIATION ON THE MANPOWER LIMITATIONS BETWEEN PHASES. THEY SUGGESTED THAT IF, ON THE OTHER HAND, THE DISPARITY WERE NOT QUANTIFIED DURING PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS THEN, NUMERICAL SPECIFICATION OF THE COMMON CEILING MIGHT HAVE LITTLE VALUE, 8\* 5#3 \$8 0-4856 2343 17-,58\*83\$, NUMERICAL SPECIFICATION OF THE COMMON CEILING MIGHT BE UNNECESSARY EXCEPT AS AN ATTEMPT TO PROTECT THE WEST FROM A POSSIBLE PROPOSAL BY THE SOVIETS IN PHASE II THAT THE COMMON CEILING BE SET AT A LEVEL SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW 700,000. US REPS ON A PERSONAL BASIS SUGGESTED THAT TO MEET THIS CONTINGENCY,

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03607 01 OF 02 071720Z

ONE MIGHT CONSIDER IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT AN INTRA-ALLIED COMMITMENT NOT TO AGREE TO A COMMON CEILING LOWER THAN A SPECIFIED NUMBER.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03607 02 OF 02 071743Z

50  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 EB-07 /096 W

----- 078033

R 071545Z JUL 75  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2588

SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USDELMBFR VIENNA  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3607

NOFORN

8. SPECIFIC NATIONAL REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. FRG REPS SAID THAT THEY OPPOSED SAYING ANYTHING TO THE EAST WHICH WOULD INDICATE WESTERN WILLINGNESS TO NEGOTIATE IN PHASE II ON THE ALLOCATION OF WESTERN REDUCTIONS. THEY SAID THEIR PRESENT POSITION WAS THAT FORMAL ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUCH ALLOCATION SHOULD BE MADE ONLY AFTER SIGNATURE OF A PHASE II AGREEMENT. HOWEVER, THEY ADDED THAT THEY CONTEMPLATED THAT IT WOULD ALSO BE NECESSARY TO INFORMALLY ADVISE THE EAST PRIOR TO SIGNATURE OF THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION.

9. SUPPLEMENT. IN DISTRIBUTING THE SUPPLEMENT US REPS STATED THAT IT WAS DRAFTED TO DEAL WITH THE MAJOR POINTS RAISED IN THE FRG SPEAKING NOTE (NATO 3397). DURING THE GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, THE FOLLOWING SUBJECT AREAS WERE SUGGESTED AS CANDIDATES FOR INCLUSION IN THE PAPER.

A. DELINEATION OF SOVIET NUCLEAR LIMITATIONS;  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03607 02 OF 02 071743Z

B. THE UNIQUE CHARACTER OF OPTION III; AND

C. MANPOWER LIMITATIONS OF LIMITED DURATION TO BE INCLUDED IN PHASE I.

10. NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT DEFINITION. RUTH STATED TO RESOR BILATERALLY THAT THE FRG THOUGHT THAT THE US STATEMENT PAPER ON AIRCRAFT DEFINITION (TEXT IN STATE 146646, PARAS 5-16) WAS EXCELLENT. HE SAID THE FRG HAD ONE QUESTION ON THIS TOPIC, NAMELY, WHETHER THOSE FEATURES OF NUCLEAR CAPABLE AIRCRAFT WHICH DISTINGUISHED SUCH AIRCRAFT FROM CONVENTIONAL MODELS MIGHT IN THE FUTURE BECOME LESS PRONOUNCED AND USABLE TO DRAW A DIVIDING LINE. RESOR ON PERSONAL BASIS RESPONDED THAT THE THOUGHT THAT THE BASIC US POLICY REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMAND AND CONTROL WOULD NOT CHANGE AND, ACCORDINGLY, THAT THERE WOULD ALWAYS BE SIGNIFICANTLY DISTINGUISHING FEATURES. HOWEVER, HE INDICATED HE WOULD RAISE THIS ISSUE WITH WASHINGTON TO OBTAIN AUTHORITATIVE RESPONSE. REQUEST WASHINGTON AGENCIES DEVELOP GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT.

11. FRG REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL DATA WITH RESPECT TO SOVIET NUCLEARS (NATO 3558). US REPS ASKED THE FRG WHAT IT HAD IN MIND ON THIS ISSUE. THE FRG APPEARS TO WANT THIS INFORMATION

AS BACKGROUND DATA AGAINST WHICH TO DECIDE HOW TO HANDLE IN  
PUBLIC AND IN PARLIAMENTS THE POINT MADE BY THE "NEXT STEPS  
PAPER" (PARAGRAPH 39) THAT THE SOVIET NUCLEAR FORCES MOST  
THREATENING TO WESTERN EUROPE WERE LOCATED OUTSIDE THE AREA  
OF REDUCTIONS. THE US REPS POINTED OUT THE SENSITIVE  
IMPLICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH DRAWING ARMAMENTS OUTSIDE OF THE  
NGA INTO DISCUSSION OF THE US NUCLEAR OFFER. ROTH  
RECOGNIZED THE NEED TO AVOID RAISING ISSUES WHICH COULD  
INVOLVE DISCUSSIONS OF ALLIED SYSTEMS SUCH AS SO-CALLED FBS  
IN THIS CONTEXT.  
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic DecapTIONing:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 07 JUL 1975  
**DecapTION Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**DecapTION Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO03607  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzkwn.tel  
**Line Count:** 230  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** NOFORN  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** NOFORN  
**Reference:** A) STATE 156821; B) USNATO 3494 DTG 281340Z JUNE 75 C) STATE 156829 D) STATE 157750 E) STATE 144904; F) STATE 149343  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: DULY 4 TRILATERAL MEETING IN BONN  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006